. ,	OPE	
E	SEP 2 5 2002 TRANSMITTAL LETTER (General - Patent Pending)	Docket No. 112701-066
F	Repartication Of: Ballevre et al.	
	Serial No. Filing Date Examiner 09/508,635 May 18, 2000 D. Lukton	Group Art Unit 1653
	Title: ORGAN SPECIFIC NUTRITION	
	TO THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS:  Transmitted herewith is:  Response and Request for Reconsideration of Requirement Return Receipt Postcard  in the above identified application.	SEP 2 7 2002 TECH CENTER 1600/2900
	No additional fee is required.  A check in the amount of is attached.  The Assistant Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge and credit Deposit Acta as described below. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.  Charge the amount of  Credit any overpayment.  Charge any additional fee required.	ccount No. 02-1818
•		

Robert M. Barrett (30,142) ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANTS Bell, Boyd & Lloyd LLC P.O. Box 1135 Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135

Signature

document and fee is being deposited on 9/19/2002 with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail under 37 O.F.R. 1.8 and is addressed to the Assistant commits orien for Patents, Washington, D.C. i certify that this 20231

Dated: September 19, 2002

Signature of Person Mailing Correspondence

Robert J. Buccieri

Typed or Printed Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

cc:



## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants:

Ballevre et al.

Appl. No.:

09/508,635 May 18, 2000

Filed: Title:

ORGAN SPECIFIC NUTRITION

Art Unit:

1653

Examiner: Docket No.:

D. Lukton 112701-066

Commissioner for Patents Washington, DC 20231

RESPONSE AND REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF REQUIREMENT

Sir:

Applicants submit this Response and Request for Reconsideration of Requirement in response to the Office Action mailed on August 20, 2002. In the Office Action, the Patent Office has required Applicants to elect a specific organ as a species. Applicants hereby provisionally elect the small intestines. However, Applicants note that this election is made provisionally. In this regard, Applicants reserve the right to Petition the Commissioner From Requirement for a Restriction Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.144.

Applicants hereby expressly traverse the species requirement. In the first instance, Applicants note that all of the claims are generic to the claimed species. Accordingly, there is no purpose for the election of species requirement. Indeed, the election of species will only create undue burden both for the Applicants and the Examiner.

Moreover, Applicants have previously pointed out that the election of species requirement does not comply with the MPEP, see, for example, MPEP § 803.01. For the sake of brevity, Applicants will not repeat the previous arguments and traversals made, for example, in the response submitted on July 24, 2002. In this regard, all of the statements made in Applicants' previous traversals are incorporated herein by reference.

1

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Patent Office examine the invention on the merits and withdraw the election of species requirement. The election of species requirement does not comply with the requirements of the MPEP. Moreover, the election of species requirement will only result in increased work and undue burden to Applicants and the Patent Office.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

Ву

Robert M. Barrett Reg. No. 30,142

P.O. Box 1135

Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135

Phone: (312) 807-4204